

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-------------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 10/604,969 | 08/28/2003 | Matthew T. Starr | 47320.0115 | 1968 |
| 20874 7: | 590 06/16/2006 | | EXAMINER | |
| WALL MARJAMA & BILINSKI | | | MARC, MCDIEUNEL | |
| SUITE 400 | ALINA STREET | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| SYRACUSE, | NY 13202 | | 3661 | |
| | • | | DATE MAILED: 06/16/2000 | 5 |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Office Action Summary | | Application No. Applicant(s) | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|------|--|--|--|
| | | 10/604,969 | STARR ET AL. | | | | |
| | | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | | McDieunel Marc | 3661 | | | | |
| | The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply | | | | | | |
| WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any | ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUS6(a). In no event, however, markill apply and will expire SIX (6) cause the application to become | JNICATION. By a reply be timely filed MONTHS from the mailing date of this content of the content of the mailing date of the content of the | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | | |
| 1) | Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 Fe | ebruary 2006. | | | | | |
| 2a)□ | | action is non-final. | | | | | |
| 3)□ | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | | | |
| . – | closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | |
| Dispositi | on of Claims | | | | | | |
| 4)🖂 | ·)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-39</u> is/are pending in the application. | | | | | | |
| | 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | |
| 5) | 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | |
| 6)🖂 | ☑ Claim(s) <u>1-39</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | | |
| 7) | Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | | |
| 8)[| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | | |
| Applicati | on Papers | | | | | | |
| 9)🖾 | The specification is objected to by the Examiner | · . | | | | | |
| 10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | | |
| | Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | | |
| 11) 🔲 | 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | | |
| Priority u | nder 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | |
| | 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: | | | | | | |
| | 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. | | | | | | |
| | 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No | | | | | | |
| | 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage | | | | | | |
| * \$ | application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | |
| | co the attached detailed Office action for a list (| or the certified copies i | iot received. | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Attachment | | 🗖 | | | | | |
| | e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | | ew Summary (PTO-413) No(s)/Mail Date | | | | |
| 3) 🔀 Infom | nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date | | of Informal Patent Application (PTO- | 152) | | | |

Application/Control Number: 10/604,969

Art Unit: 3661

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-39 are presented for examination.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

The title should be brief but technically accurate and descriptive, preferably from two to seven words. See 37 CFR 1.72(a). Appropriate correction is required.

3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of the word "disclose", the abstract should be a single paragraph in a single page and the title on top of the abstract is too long.

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Objections

4. Claim 20 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 20 should depend on 16 instead of 21. Appropriate correction is required.

Double Patenting

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection

Application/Control Number: 10/604,969

Art Unit: 3661

is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

7. Claims 1-39 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-31 of copending Application No. 10/604,971. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the application is broader than that of the copending application, since a nonvolatile memory for storing an inventory of locations has been omitted.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

It is well settled that the omission of an element, and its function is an obvious expedient if the remaining elements perform the same function as before. *In re Karlson*, 136 USPQ 184 (CCPA 1963). Also note *Ex parte Rainu*, 168 USPQ 375 (Bd. App. 1969). Omission of a reference element or step whose function is not needed would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Art Unit: 3661

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to McDieunel Marc whose telephone number is (571) 272-6964. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30-5:00 Mon-Thu.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Black can be reached on (571) 272-6956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

McDieunel Marc

Examiner

Art Unit 3661

Tuesday, May 30, 2006

MM/

HUWINA BLAUN EXAMINATION OF THE RIVING GROUP 3600